

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Robinson Dane Royce,) Civil Action No. 1:19-00460-BHH
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.)
)
)
 Andrew M. Saul, Commissioner of Social)
 Security,)
)
 Defendant.)
)
)
 ORDER

ORDER

Andrew M. Saul, Commissioner of Social Security,
Defendant.

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's motion for attorney's fees pursuant to the Equal Access to Justice Act ("EAJA"), 28 U.S.C. § 2412. In the motion, Plaintiff seeks attorney's fees in the amount of \$2,119.09, representing 11.30 attorney hours at the hourly rate of \$187.53. (ECF No. 19). On December 27, 2019, the Commissioner filed a response to the motion, stating that he does not object to the requested amount of \$2,119.09 in attorney's fees. (ECF No. 20).

Attorney's fees may be awarded pursuant to EAJA where the government's position is not substantially justified. The substantial justification test is one of reasonableness in law and fact. See *Pierce v. Underwood*, 487 U.S. 552, 565 (1988). The district court has broad discretion to set the attorney fee amount. “[A] district court will always retain substantial discretion in fixing the amount of an EAJA award. Exorbitant, unfounded, or procedurally defective fee applications . . . are matters that the district court can recognize.” *Hyatt v. North Carolina Dep’t of Human Res.*, 315 F.3d 239, 254 (4th Cir. 2002) (citing *Comm'r v. Jean*, 496 U.S. 154, 163 (1990)). Moreover, the court should not only consider the “position taken by the United States in the civil action,” but also the “action or failure to act by the agency upon which the civil action is based.” 28 U.S.C. § 2412(d)(2)(D), as

amended by P.L. 99-80, § 2(c)(2)(B).

After consideration, it is hereby **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's motion (ECF No. 19) is granted insofar as the Court awards Plaintiff \$2,119.00 in attorney's fees pursuant to EAJA. Additionally, the Commissioner will determine whether Plaintiff has any outstanding federal debt to be offset from the attorney's fees, and if Plaintiff has no outstanding federal debt, and if Plaintiff produces an assignment indicating that he has assigned his right to attorney's fees to his counsel, the Commissioner will honor Plaintiff's assignment of attorney's fees to counsel and make the check payable to Plaintiff's counsel. However, if Plaintiff has outstanding federal debt, the Commissioner will make the check payable to Plaintiff directly and deliver the check to the business address of Plaintiff's counsel, and the amount of fees payable to Plaintiff will be the balance of the stipulated attorney's fees remaining after subtracting the amount of Plaintiff's outstanding federal debt. If Plaintiff's outstanding federal debt exceeds the stipulated amount of attorney's fees, then the stipulated amount will be used to offset that debt and no amount shall be paid to Plaintiff.¹

IT IS SO ORDERED.

January 2, 2020
Charleston, South Carolina

/s/Bruce H. Hendricks
Bruce Howe Hendricks
United States District Judge

¹ As the Supreme Court made clear in *Astrue v. Ratliff*, attorney's fees under EAJA are made payable to the prevailing litigant and not to the litigant's attorney. 560 U.S. 586, 598 (2010) (holding that the plain text of EAJA requires that attorney's fees be awarded to the litigant, thus subjecting EAJA fees to an offset of any pre-existing federal debts).